

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claim 16 is canceled. Therefore, claims 1-15 and 17-25 are pending. Claims 1, 10 and 20 are independent.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Applicant appreciates that claims 20-25 are indicated to be allowable. Applicant further appreciates that claims 4-6 and 16-17 are indicated to define allowable subject matter. The features of allowable claim 16 is incorporated into independent claim 10.

**SCOPE OF CLAIMS**

Several of the claims are amended merely to address informal issues such as correcting antecedent basis issues and to put the claims in better form for US practice. Unless specifically commented upon, it is intended that the scopes of the claims remain substantially the same.

OBJECTION TO THE CLAIMS

The claims are objected to for minor informalities. *See Office Action, page 2.* The claims are amended to address the issues raised by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

§ 102 REJECTION – FURUSAWA

Claims 1, 2, 3, 7 and 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Furusawa et al. (US Publication 2002/0195920). *See Office Action, pages 2-5.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

For a Section 102 rejection to be proper, the cited reference must teach or suggest each and every claimed element. *See M.P.E.P. 2131; M.P.E.P. 706.02.* Thus, if the cited reference fails to teach or suggest one or more elements, then the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

In this instance, Furusawa fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed element. For example, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein a radius of curvature from a center of the shadow mask in a major-axis, minor-axis and diagonal-axis direction is substantially the same.”

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies upon Table 2 as disclosed in Furusawa to teach this feature. *See Office Action, page 3, lines 20-22.* Furusawa discloses that Table 2 is a table of radii of curvature of the curved

surface of the shadow mask in the respective major axis direction ( $R_{ma}$ ), minor axis direction ( $R_{mi}$ ) and diagonal axis direction ( $R_d$ ) at respective distances  $L$  from the center of the mask. See *Furusawa*, paragraph [0040].

Table 2 clearly shows that at similar distances  $L$  away from the center, the radii of curvature for each axis direction are different. For example, at distance  $L = 0$  mm (at the center),  $R_{ma} = 1847.5$  mm,  $R_{mi} = 1722.6$  mm and  $R_d = 1800.5$  mm. As another example, at distance  $L = 50$  mm from the center,  $R_{ma} = 1812.5$  mm,  $R_{mi} = 1709.4$  mm and  $R_d = 1779.4$  mm.

It is clear that the radii of curvature as disclosed in Table 2 of *Furusawa* are **not** substantially the same as recited in claim 1. For at least this reason, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, independent claim 1 is distinguishable over *Furusawa*.

Regarding independent claim 10, the claim is amended to incorporate the features of claim 16, which the Examiner indicated defines allowable subject matter. Therefore, independent claim 10 is distinguishable over *Furusawa*.

Claims 2, 3, 7 and 11-15 depend from independent claims 1 and 10 directly or indirectly. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated with respect to independent claims 1 or 10, claims 2, 3, 7 and 11-15 are also distinguishable over *Furusawa*.

Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 3, 7 and 10-15 based on Furusawa be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – FURUSAWA, NISHIKI

Claims 8 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furusawa in view of Nishiki et al. (US Publication 2001/0018309). *See Office Action, page 6.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 8 and 18 depend from independent claims 1 and 10 respectively and it has been demonstrated that claims 1 and 10 are distinguishable over Furusawa. Nishiki has not been relied upon to correct for at least the above-noted deficiencies of Furusawa. Thus, claims 1 and 10 are also distinguishable over the combination of Furusawa and Nishiki.

For at least due to the dependency thereon as well as on their own merits, claims 8 and 18 are also distinguishable over the combination of Furusawa and Nishiki. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 8 and 18 based on the combination of Furusawa and Nishiki be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – FURUSAWA, KAWAMURA

Claims 9 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furusawa in view of Kawamura et al. (US Patent 6,448,706). *See Office Action, pages 6-7.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 9 and 19 depend from independent claims 1 and 10 respectively and it has been demonstrated that claims 1 and 10 are distinguishable over Furusawa. Kawamura has not been relied upon to correct for at least the above-noted deficiencies of Furusawa. Thus, claims 1 and 10 are also distinguishable over the combination of Furusawa and Kawamura.

For at least due to the dependency thereon as well as on their own merits, claims 9 and 19 are also distinguishable over the combination of Furusawa and Kawamura. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 9 and 19 based on the combination of Furusawa and Kawamura be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg.

*U.S. Application No. 10/717,512  
Docket No. 3449-0287P  
Reply filed November 9, 2005  
Art Unit: 2882  
Page 21 of 21*

No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &, BIRCH, LLP

By: Esther H. Chong  
Esther H. Chong  
Reg. No. 40,953

EHC/HNS/ags  
3449-0287P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Attached hereto is one (1) sheet of corrected drawing that comply with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.84. The corrected formal drawing incorporate the following changes:

- Axis labels are put in English.

Applicants respectfully requests that the corrected formal drawings be approved and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.